DOCUMENT RESUME

ED 283 379 FL 016 768

AUTHOR Garcia, Gilbert Narro
TITLE English and the Native Language in the Bilingual Education Classroom: Giving Body to the Oldest Wobble.
PUB DATE Apr 87
NOTE 36p.; Paper presented at the Annual Meeting of the American Educational Research Association (68th, Washington, DC, April 20-24, 1987).
PUB TYPE Information Analyses (070) -- Reports - Evaluative/Feasibility (142) -- Speeches/Conference Papers (150)

EDRS PRICE MF01/PC02 Plus Postage.
DESCRIPTORS *Bilingual Education; *Classroom Communication; Data Interpretation; Difficulty Level; Educational Strategies; Elementary Secondary Education; *English (Second Language); *Instructional Effectiveness; *Language of Instruction; Language Role; Language Usage; Limited English Speaking; Longitudinal Studies; *Research Utilization; Second Language Instruction; Teaching Methods
IDENTIFIERS *Simplification (Language)

ABSTRACT

Three major studies on English and native language use in the classrooms of limited-English-proficient (LEP) students are reviewed for the insights they provide on effective teaching practices and special services for this population. The bilingual education profession misunderstands and misuses what the literature says about instruction for LEP students, especially where it concerns English and native language use. Specific areas in which research data are misinterpreted are noted, including overly prescriptive policies for the exclusive use of English in the classroom, the heterogeneity of LEP students, the use of native-language resources, rigid language-use regulations, the potential for coexistence of English and the native language, and the use of simplification. (MSE)

****
* Reproductions supplied by EDRS are the best that can be made *
* from the original document. *
****

ED283379

ENGLISH AND THE NATIVE LANGUAGE IN THE BILINGUAL EDUCATION CLASSROOM: GIVING BODY TO THE OLDEST WOBBLE

BY

GILBERT NARRO GARCIA

US DEPARTMENT OF EDUCATION

PAPER PRESENTED AT THE 1987 AERA CONFERENCE

WASHINGTON, D.C.

U.S. DEPARTMENT OF EDUCATION
Office of Educational Research and Improvement
EDUCATIONAL RESOURCES INFORMATION CENTER (ERIC)

☑ This document has been reproduced as received from the person or organization originating it.

☐ Minor changes have been made to improve reproduction quality.

• Points of view or opinions stated in this document do not necessarily represent official OERI position or policy.

"PERMISSION TO REPRODUCE THIS MATERIAL HAS BEEN GRANTED BY

G. Garcia

TO THE EDUCATIONAL RESOURCES INFORMATION CENTER (ERIC)."

THE VIEWS EXPRESSED IN THIS PAPER ARE THOSE OF THE AUTHOR AND DO NOT REPRESENT THE VIEWS OR POLICIES OF THE U.S. DEPARTMENT OF EDUCATION. DO NOT QUOTE WITHOUT PROPER CITATION.

FL016468

BEST COPY AVAILABLE

ABOUT THE AUTHOR: GILBERT N. GARCIA IS AN EDUCATION RESEARCH ANALYST IN THE U.S. DEPARTMENT OF EDUCATION. HE IS CURRENTLY WORKING ON THE CONGRESSIONALLY-MANDATED NATIONAL ASSESSMENT OF THE CHAPTER 1 PROGRAM. HE IS THE FORMER MANAGER OF THE `PART C' RESEARCH EFFORTS FUNDED THROUGH THE OFFICE OF BILINGUAL EDUCATION AND MINORITY LANGUAGES AFFAIRS.

In March 1987, the General Accounting Office issued the latest report on their assessment of the research literature on the effects of bilingual education for limited English proficient (LEP) students. GAO staff concluded that,

> "...only 2 of the 10 experts (surveyed by GAO) agree with the Department that there is insufficient evidence to support the law's requirement of the use of native language to the extent necessary to reach the objective of learning English. Second, 7 of the 10 believe that the department is incorrect in characterizing the evidence as showing the promise of teaching methods that do not use native languages. Few agree with the department's suggestion that long-term school problems experienced by Hispanic youth are associated with native language instruction" (page 3.)

This summary was the key that motivated my paper, though it is not its raison d'etre. The literature is replete with the results of research and evaluation studies that document the conditions and variable effects of instruction for limited English proficient (LEP) students. It is full of tested and anecdotal accounts of pedagogic efforts to help LEP students learn English, become students, and succeed in schools. But, the overriding environment today is one whereby the body of literatures on bilingual, second language, and compensatory education are considered more suspect than ever. Especially if

they address issues of elementary and secondary schooling for LEP students.

The results of many formal studies in these three fields have been minimally interpreted, misinterpreted, and maligned principally, I believe, because of the issues they address. In particular, the literatures address issues related to the features of instruction for LEP students, the role of English in their classrooms, and their effects on instruction and learning. But, more significantly, they also address issues imbedded in many of the prevailing policies and practices regarding the use of native languages for what should be complementary and parallel academic outcomes. For sure, the results of some of the research and evaluation studies cited to argue for or against the manners in which LEP students should or could be instructed are not uniformly the most psychometrically sound. Many of the studies are localized and some can not be easily generalized to the national level. But, there are many solid studies whose results are applicable to the wide array of pedagogic issues facing school officials at the state and national levels. It is not the case that the whole body of this literature has little of value to inform policy planners about instruction for LEP students. It should not be tossed aside as some kind of devious plan to establish either theory or hypothesis dedicated to mislead the nation about the special forms of instruction which LEP students should get.

In some limited cases is it has been easy to misinterpret and disregard this literature for another set of reasons. That is, many of the data from studies in these fields have not been thoroughly analyzed or subjected to the rigorous "implications" and "applications" tests which are necessary, especially for education research data that tends to be mostly qualitative. One negative result is that the data and the results of their analysis have been left wide open to much loose interpretation at best and erroneous manipulation at worst.

I believe that much of the research is sound, and that it should be looked at for what is says about the effects and the limits of the effects being reported. The "limitations", I might add, are not the result of research and evaluation studies far too psychometrically sophisticated to gauge student progress in unsophisticated programs of instruction or of complex programs of instruction far too variable-laden too indicate the features of student progress. But I believe that the limitations are the result of various combinations of these two realities.

Two messages have emerged loud and clear over the past 10 years that most of the formal research on language minority LEP students and issues has been conducted. The first is that the effects of the use of certain combinations of English and the native language in the classroom appear to be quite variable.

The second message is that practitioners continue to be fond of doing one thing while apparently believing another. With respect to the first statement, nothing in the literature establishes a negative and direct effect on learning as a consequence of students being in classrooms where the native language is used for instructional purposes. While some of the literature cites situations where LEP students who were taught mostly in their native language did not fare as well as other LEP students taught in English, the majority of those studies have been of short duration or have relied only on achievement testing to gauge student progress or have looked only at the language variable to establish the effect. The literature on second language learning cites a multitude of statements to the effect that language skills are learned and acquired over a span of many years and are the result of numerous interrelated factors. To attribute the extent of learning English to the use of the native language to accomplish this endeavor is ridiculous.

With regard to the second statement, many teachers and administrators in this field have been proud to pronounce about the utility of learning in and learning two languages at the same time that they tend to consider the use of two languages in the classroom as either taking precious time away from learning in general or learning English in particular.

The purpose of this paper is not to correct the historical record. Neither do I propose to directly challenge the current views or statements about the use of English and native languages in the classroom. Rather, its purpose is to review the results of some of the most prominent and recent research and evaluation studies in the fields of bilingual, second language, and compensatory education. The reader will have to determine ultimately whether the debate needs to or should continue on the planes it now exists, or continue on more valid and reliable grounds; in fact, on the same ground that other education research stands.

I have relied on the results of three major studies to establish the basis of my assessment. They are:

- The results of the work completed by Lily Wong Fillmore, included in her report to the US Department of Education titled, Learning English Through Bilingual Instruction (1985). The sample included about 500 Hispanic and Chinese students in the 3rd and 5th grades in 17 classrooms in 8 Title I elementary schools in 4 school districts in California. This seminal work describes many of the principal features of instruction in the context of classrooms with LEP students of various ages, backgrounds, and academic and linguistic proficiencies. It also includes a description of what I consider to be some of the most valid manners to

assess language learning to date.

- The results of the first year of assessment completed by Malcom Young in his report to the US Department of Education titled, Instructing Children With Limited English Ability (1986). The nationally representative study was conducted in 86 schools in 18 school districts and included about 9500 1st and 3rd grade students. This ongoing national assessment of the achievement of LEP students in Title VII-funded programs is the most recent and expansive study to date of the long-term progress of students with varying characteristics receiving special services of varying types.

- The results of a case substudy of Chapter 1 services in seven schools out of a sample of 24 schools with Chapter 1 programs. The results of the research were carried out by Brian Rowan and Larry Guthrie and are included in their report to the US Department of Education titled, Instructional Services for Limited English Proficient Chapter 1 Students (1986).

These three reports include some of the most detailed and psychometrically sound information on the services which LEP students have received and are receiving. The study being

conducted by Young is the only nationally representative study of the three I reviewed. But, the results of the other two studies are indicative of much of what appears to be happening in the country.

There are other studies and reports, but time and focus have compelled me to look mostly that this partial but strong sample of studies. I looked that these studies and their results very carefully and narrowly. Because the purpose of the paper is to report on the results of my efforts to investigate what the literature says about the use of English and the native language to teach LEP students, I looked principally at those parts of the studies and reports that assessed teaching practices that included the use of one or both of the languages, as well as at those parts that reported the effects of the practices or at least reported the presence and absence of features of effective instruction surrounding the reported practices. The primary reason I carried out the investigation was to continue to establish what the literature is saying about the role of English and the native language in the education of LEP students and the extent to which English and the native language are being used in instruction for LEP students. I did this in order to understand the basis of the formal push in the country toward instructional programs for LEP students in which, it is believed, the native language still has too large a role to play in their education when it should have no role to play at all.

My first contention is that the research cited here--and other research in the three fields--suggests policies and practices that vary from the current mode of thinking about instructional programs for LEP students. The evidence suggests many different manners in which these students might be instructed. Most importantly, the evidence suggests a very complex and interrelated situation. In fact, the reality established by the body of the literature goes far beyond the widely held but simplistic notions of whether LEP students should be instructed solely in English or in English and the native language. It is unfortunate that current arguments still exist on this level. At this level, the tendency is to invite the pervasive "wobbles" I sense regarding the design and implementation of programs for LEP students. The wobbles, I believe, are the result of educators soliciting the expedient conviction rather than making use of the tested hypothesis. The evidence I describe is an attempt to establish the substantive level at which the arguments should exist. This evidence gives "body" to the arguments (or hypotheses) that should be entertained regarding the most effective ways to instruct LEP students.

The evidence strongly points out that the instruction which most LEP students receive in special programs in US schools is in English. The situation does not appear to have changed for the

past four to six years. But the evidence also points out that where the native language has a role to play, it is in classrooms in which the LEP students who are the least proficient in English are being taught. A reasonable assertion, though not necessarily based on what I have stated up to this point, is that school districts and school staff have designed programs of instruction for LEP students which are generally responding to their linguistic and academic needs (pardon the trite term, but there seems no other). That is, where it is needed, the native language is often used for academic and for social purposes in varying degrees, presumably based on the diagnosed needs of the LEP students. Most importantly, the data still indicate that the majority of LEP students being served in special programs are the lowest achievers. There are many LEP students who are not being served in any systematic manner, but that is another discussion.

There is a related point which needs to be mentioned. The evidence also indicates that the school and home environments of most of the LEP students served in special programs such as bilingual education are not too much different from those described for students in Chapter 1 programs and schools. This is strongly implied in the recent report to the Congress titled, Poverty, Achievement and the Distribution of Compensatory Education Services (1986). Part of the National Assessment of Chapter 1, the report posits that students served by these programs are more likely to be poor, belong to minority groups,

live in neighborhoods that are poor, live in households characterized by long-term poverty, and generally lack sufficient reading proficiency to participate effectively in school. The parallels exist notwithstanding the fact that Chapter 1 programs serve large proportions of white and black students. While the Young study of LEP services in programs of bilingual education did not use the same features used in the Chapter 1 study to investigate the characteristics of LEP students, the schools in which these students are enrolled appear to share almost identical characteristics. Much like Chapter 1 students, including Chapter 1 LEP students, the vast majority of non-Chapter 1 LEP students belong to one minority group or another, and most do not achieve above the 50th percentile in reading and math. This being the case, the issue of language should not be singled out as more or less important than any of the other issues related to the instruction which LEP students should receive.

My second contention is that neither the use of English nor the native language, regardless of their proportions of use during the day or week or school year, are the necessary conditions for LEP student progress in the classroom. Either or both fulfill a basic condition, but they are not the sufficient condition for student success. Neither, I might add, are they a sufficient condition to establish the failure which many LEP students experience, and which is attributed to the programs serving them.

My investigations lead me to the following four conclusions about the use of English and the native language related to instruction of LEP students:

1. In many programs of bilingual education, students in the lower elementary grades are taught in both English and the native language initially, but the purposes for which the native language are used and the proportion of time it is used are progressively reduced during the typical school year. Recent evidence also indicates that the native language is used less in the third grade than in the first grade.

2. Most LEP students tend to be in situations where in neither academic instruction nor English language arts instruction does the use of simplified English predominate.

3. The use of the native language and instruction in native language arts versus the use of English and instruction in English language arts varies from subject to subject and from langauge group to language group. Recent evidence indicates that Spanish language students are less likely than Chinese language students to receive instruction in English language arts. They are more likely than Chinese students to receive

instruction in their native language.

4. The vast proportion of use of the native language is with LEP students who have the least English proficiency or who are the lowest achieving students in the program.

The Evidence Regarding Statement # 1: The data from the national longitudinal assessment of services to LEP students indicate a pattern of a reduced use of the native language when 1st graders are compared to 3rd graders. That is, Spanish and Chinese language 1st graders both began the year receiving a high or moderate amount of academic instruction using the native language. However, this was less the case for the Chinese language students. Further, far fewer 3rd grade students than 1st graders began the year with academic instruction using high or moderate levels of their native language. Many of them received little academic instruction using their native language.

Looking at the data in a slightly different way, the picture that emerges is one where students move away from clusters 1 thru 3 (with a range of academic use of native language from continued to minimal use) to clusters in which the native language plays a less formal role. (See Figure 1 for definitions of cluster types and cluster sequences used in the study.) Thus, for those who

began in category "B", it was more common for them to end up in category "C" and for those who began in category "C", there was a notable decrease in the amount of native langauge use and thus a shift to clusters "D" and "E/F", indicating a minimal native language use.

The Evidence Regarding Statement # 2: The data from the longitudinal assessment indicate that regular English and the special English language arts instruction which LEP students receive is provided almost exclusively in English. Use of the native language during these periods was about 5% to 10%. The situation was similar for other non-language academic subjects, though the percent of use of English was higher for 3rd graders than for 1st graders.

But the data on the type or level of English used indicate that Spanish language students were more likely than their Chinese peers to receive `simplified' English when instruction was in English. In particular, Spanish language students were just as likely to receive simplified English instruction during English language arts as during their non-language arts lessons. In contrast, Chinese language students were more likely to receive simplified English during their non-language arts classes than during their English language arts classes. There was a tendency to decrease the use of simplified English by the 3rd grade for the Chinese language students. Generally, only about 40% of the

Spanish language students received instruction through simplified English. The percentage is lower for the Chinese language students. Only about 17% received instruction through simplified English, though the rate was slightly higher for 3rd graders.

Looked at from the "clusters" perspective, the data indicate that 43% of the 1st grade students and 56% of the 3rd graders were in instruction categorized as cluster "C" (in this cluster, the proportion of native language use versus English language use ranges from 7% to 37%). In these situations, the use of simplified English did not predominate for any academic subject, including English language arts. The data are similar for students in cluster "D" (in this cluster, the native language is used no more than 7.5% of the time). Of the 1st graders in this cluster, 68% of them were in situations where neither in academic instruction nor in English language arts instruction did simplified English predominate. The same was true for 50% of the third graders in this type of cluster.

The Evidence Regarding Statement # 3: The data from the longitudinal assessment on the 1st grade students indicate that 48% of the Spanish language students were in classrooms with a continued and high emphasis on the use of the native language (as defined by clusters 1 thru 3), while 14% and 9% were in classrooms in which the native language had no academic use (clusters 8 & 9, respectively). The same was true for the

Chinese language LEP students. On the other hand, only 18% of the "other language" students (not Spanish and not Chinese) were in clusters 1 thru 3, while 52% were in clusters 8 and 9! Across all three language groups (Spanish, Chinese, and Other Language), a lower proportion of grade 3 LEP students than grade 1 LEP students were in clusters 1 thru 3 (51%, 48% and 18% of the three 1st grade groups, respectively, versus 30%, 28%, and 12%, respectively). Correspondingly, a higher proportion of the three grade 3 groups (34%, 42% and 56%, respectively) were in cluster sequences 8 and 9.

In addition, 1st and 3rd grade LEP students received about 5 hours of regular English language arts instruction per week, plus about 3 hours of special or simplified English language arts. English proficient students, on the other hand, received from 9 to 11 hours of regular English language arts instruction. Within the LEP student groups, Chinese and "other" language groups were more likely to receive more instruction in regular English language arts than the Spanish language groups. The Spanish language students were more likely to receive instruction in native language arts than the other LEP students, but they were more likely to receive more instruction in mathematics, science, and social science than the Chinese and other language students.

The data also indicate that LEP students received very high levels of regular English language arts instruction which

included small amounts of native language use (presumably for explanation and for clarification). But, the amount of English used was less for Spanish students in mathematics, science, and social studies when compared to the amount of used for the other LEP students (though they were above 50%!).

The Evidence Regarding Statement # 4: LEP students in bilingual education classrooms vary considerably in their degrees of English proficiency. For example, the Spanish language students were more frequently rated by their principal teachers as lower in English oral proficiency than were their Chinese language and "other" language peers. But, the major proportion of all of the LEP students were rated as fluent or as at a native speaker level in their native language, though there were more low ratings for the Spanish language students than for the Chinese language students. A higher proportion of 3rd graders (40%) than 1st graders (26%) were rated as being at fluent or native speaker levels of English. Further, only a very small proportion of the LEP students were rated low in both English and the native language, while about 13% of them were rated as having a very limited proficiency in either of the two languages.

Looked at from the service clusters perspective, the data indicate that both the 1st and 3rd graders with the least English proficiency were receiving instruction that included the most use of the native language. Conversely, in both grades, the group of

students with highest English proficiency ratings were in the service clusters in which English was the predominant language used for instruction. On the other hand, there were some students who began the school year receiving instruction through a fair amount of English, but were receiving much more instruction in their native language toward the end of the year. Presumably they were reclassified and placed in different settings to accommodate their highly limited English proficiency levels. Further, LEP students who scored lowest on the cognitive measures used in the longitudinal assessment were most likely to be in classrooms where the instruction was mostly in their native language. In fact, 3rd graders whose instruction was characterized as having a marked increase in the use of the native language as the school year progressed scored the lowest when compared to students in the other cluster sequences. The situation seems more pronounced for 3rd graders than for 1st graders, relative to their peers in the other service clusters.

The data indicate that many of the LEP students are moved out of sequences noted for the high use of the native language as they improve their proficiency in English and/or improve their academic standing. The transfers occur during the year or from one year to the next. The practice results in two types of movements. First, LEP students with low cognitive abilities and low levels of English proficiency remain in or are transferred into the clusters in which the use of high or higher levels of

the native language are a necessity. In many cases, they are moved into cluster-situations such as #1 through #3. Second, LEP students whose English language skills have improved enough for them to be able to participate in mostly-English instruction and in on-grade level instruction are transferred into other more advanced classrooms--and higher numbered clusters. On the other hand, the data do not indicate and no conclusion can be implied that the contributing factor related to the low scores on the language and the cognitive measures for some of the LEP students was the instruction they received in their native language(s). The evidence establishes that many LEP students were being taught in their native language precisely because they were low achievers and highly limited in their English proficiency.

The data above are generally supported by the Chapter 1 programs case study data I looked at. The results of the case study of Chapter 1 services provided to LEP students in Chapter 1 schools indicate the following:

1. All of the schools studied provided ESL as a subject to LEP students. But students received an ESL lesson of less than an hour per day. They were pulled out of their regular classrooms for this.

2. Where the LEP students in a particular school spoke a variety of languages, only ESL was provided to them. But

where significant numbers of them spoke the same native language, some type of English and native language instruction was provided.

3. The content of daily lessons for LEP students was very similar to that of their fluent English speaking peers. But, lessons for the LEP students varied by skill level, pace of instruction, and the language of the instruction. Their lessons were at lower skills levels or at a slower pace than the lessons for their peers.

4. LEP students tended to receive very little native language assistance in any of their academic subjects.

5. Three approaches were used to provide instruction to LEP students. They were: (1) use of English as the primary language of instruction; (2) use of the native language to teach some academic content; and (3) use of the native language to support instruction in English. But the data indicate that very few of the Chapter 1 LEP students received any appreciable academic instruction in their native language.

6. The native language was used more with LEP students who were the least proficient in English. Conversely, LEP students whose language skills were more advanced received most of

their instruction in English.

7. LEP students who were the least proficient in English appeared to show improved classroom participation in classes where the native language was used. Further, the researchers supposed that because of the nature of the ESL lessons (they tended to be the most tailored to the LEP students' English proficiency levels) LEP students participated in ESL lessons more actively than in their other lessons and classes.

The results of the study conducted by Wong Fillmore provide additional support for much of what I have discussed above. She found a "growing reluctance on the part of all but the most committed teachers in bilingual education classes to use the native language of the students for instructional purposes." (page 32.). Further, the research asserts that the native language, the few times that it was used on a daily basis, was used mainly to facilitate the delivery of English instruction. But most importantly, "it was sometimes difficult to distinguish bilingual classes from all-English ones.."(page 33).

The Wong Fillmore study data indicates that in 14 of the 17 classes observed, students spent over 50% of the day in instructional activities that could be described as individual or self directed. She argues that her data indicate

that situations of this type are minimally conducive to language learning. In contrast, the data from the Chapter 1 case study indicate that the typical format for whole-classroom instruction was teacher lecture/recitation. This approach made up more than 60% of the time in more than half of the LEP students' lessons in their regular classrooms (page 28.). This does not imply that the Chapter 1 services should be viewed as better than the bilingual education program services. They merely indicate that the approaches observed were different when I compared the data on the two programs.

But of profound importance are the findings related to the classroom, instructional, and student variables associated with language learning. The Wong Fillmore data indicate a number of differences for the Chinese and the Hispanic LEP students in terms of what they apparently can tolerate in the classroom as they go about their academic and language learning tasks. The data point to some very complex notions of what is necessary for each group of students to learn in the bilingual education classroom. The considerations are far more complex than the mere use of English and/or the native language, regardless of how much of each is used. In particular, Wong Fillmore's research identified certain variables which influence the acquisition of production skills in English and other variables which influence the development of comprehension skills in English. The three variables that appear to be closely associated with the

acquisition of production skills are: the degrees of interactional opportunities available to the students; the quality of the learning environment; and the quality of the instructional language and quality of teaching. The variables associated with the acquisition of language comprehension skills are: percent of time of teacher directed instruction; quality of learning environment; quality of instructional language; and degrees of interactional opportunities available to the students. Considered together, the variables dictate a set of instructional features that inform the design of programs for LEP students. They transcend the basis of current federal and state policies regarding what the services for LEP students should look like, especially with regard to language use issues.

SUMMARY--- The data I have reviewed imply a number of considerations regarding the current state of special services for LEP students. I posit six, but there might be others from the data I reviewed. They are:

1. With respect to programs of instruction deemed to be "bilingual education" programs, they imply that policies that direct the exclusive use of English are addressing the most superficial aspects of classroom practices. Overly prescriptive policies fail to take into account some of the most fundamental factors that influence academic and language learning. Such

policies appear to run counter to what we should have learned by now about instruction and its interaction with student characteristics in general and with those of LEP students in particular.

2. The data reveal that LEP students continue to be a very heterogenous group. And the heterogeneity has flip flopped over the past eight years. Where most of the LEP students in the recent past were American born or represented a few language groups, the majority now are foreign born and represent multiple and at times, quite small and exotic language groups. Programs of instruction for this new group of LEP students must, at a minimum, accommodate the students' needs to learn how to learn in American classrooms. But in cases where bilingual instruction is not feasible, the curriculum should at least incorporate the students' cultural mannerisms and approaches to learning.

3. The data are pretty clear about the need to provide native language resources, in anticipation of those LEP students who seem to respond best in classrooms where they at least understand that if they need them, staff who know their native language and can guide them to materials in their native language are there for their use. The Chapter 1 case study data provide an

excellent insight into the problems which some LEP students encounter and the impact that English-only environments have on them.

4. Policies that foster the design of special programs with rigid language use regulations would seem to result in programs that provide services which are not supportive of the students' learning requisites.

5. The message derived from the school and classroom-level data is that English and the native language can and do coexist.

6. The general body of the data reviewed also indicate that, much like the issue of which language to use, the issue of whether to use `regular' or `simplified' English in the classroom has to be tied to the linguistic and academic proficiencies of the students being taught. One form is not necessarily more or less effective than the other. The proper use of either or both is what makes the difference between students understanding instruction or not, and between students finding it too easy to learn or just difficult enough to make learning a worthwhile challenge for them. But proper investigations of their use must precede the use of either or both in the classroom.

The results of my assessments of the data included in the three reports point out that we continue to misunderstand and misuse what the literature says about instruction for LEP students. This is especially true for the data on the role of English and the native language in the classroom. In short, it is difficult to understand the antithetical conclusions which are so prevalent today. But I do not foresee any drastic changes in attitudes and behaviors in the near future. The best that can be done is to insist that policy and other statements about programs of instruction for LEP students be fully supported by the data.

The research and evaluation studies in the fields of bilingual, second language, and compensatory education for LEP students are generally a very solid body of research. Their results might yet become the basis for some very effective programs of instruction.

FIGURE 1

SERVICE CLUSTER TYPES

Cluster Type	Descriptive Name	Subdivision Type	Subdivision Name
A	Native Language Primacy	None	-
B	Continued Instruction in Native Language and English	None	-
C	Change in Language of Instruction	C1	Slow Transition
		C2	Fast Transition
D	All English with Special Instruction in English	D1	With Native-Language-Proficient Personnel
		D2	Without Native-Language-Proficient Personnel
E	All English without Special Instruction in English	E1	With Native-Language-Proficient Personnel
		E2	Without Native-Language-Proficient Personnel

Type A: "Native Language Primacy"

In Type A "Native Language Primacy" clusters the expectations are that all students in the classroom will have the same language background and that instruction will be mainly in that language. Operationally, the critical distinction for this service cluster was that EXTENT OF NATIVE LANGUAGE USE IN ACADEMIC SUBJECTS was 90% or greater. Further, the high reliance on native language was expected to continue throughout the school year, as demonstrated by either a "no change", or possibly an "increase" response for the variable CHANGE IN NATIVE LANGUAGE USE.

FROM: Young, M.B. INSTRUCTING CHILDREN WITH LIMITED ENGLISH ABILITY: YEAR ONE REPORT OF THE NATIONAL LONGITUDINAL EVALUATION OF THE EFFECTIVENESS OF SERVICES FOR LANGUAGE MINORITY LIMITED ENGLISH PROFICIENT STUDENTS. DEVELOPMENT ASSOCIATES, ARLINGTON, VA 1986.

Additionally, to be included in this category, the services had to include the presence of NATIVE LANGUAGE ARTS INSTRUCTION, and PROGRAM SELF DESCRIPTION had to include one of the following services: bilingual classroom, content instruction in the native language, or all instruction in the native language.

Type B: "Continued Instruction in Native Language and English"

In Type B clusters, there is an attempt to balance native language instruction and proficiency with English language instruction and proficiency. The expectation is that the native language will continue to be used in instruction to some extent even after the child is English-proficient.

Operationally, schools that offered any one of the following four different patterns of instruction in the native language were classified into the Type B cluster: (1) EXTENT OF NATIVE LANGUAGE USE IN ACADEMIC SUBJECTS was 90% or more, CHANGE IN NATIVE LANGUAGE USE was "decrease"; (2) EXTENT OF NATIVE LANGUAGE USE IN ACADEMIC SUBJECTS was 16-89%, CHANGE IN NATIVE LANGUAGE USE was "no change"; (3) EXTENT OF NATIVE LANGUAGE USE IN ACADEMIC SUBJECTS was 1-89%, CHANGE IN NATIVE LANGUAGE USE was "increase"; or (4) EXTENT OF NATIVE LANGUAGE USE IN ACADEMIC SUBJECTS was 1-15%, CHANGE IN NATIVE LANGUAGE USE was "no change", PURPOSE OF NATIVE LANGUAGE USE was content instruction.

Further, in all cases the variable PROGRAM SELF DESCRIPTION was coded to include at least one of the following services: bilingual classroom, bilingual pull-out, content instruction in the native language, all instruction in the native language.

Type C: "Change in Language of Instruction"

The primary characteristic of Type C clusters is the movement away from native language content instruction in academic subjects towards all-English instruction. As with the B clusters, instructional native language use could follow more than one pattern. To be a Type C cluster, either EXTENT OF NATIVE LANGUAGE USE IN ACADEMIC SUBJECTS was 1-15%, CHANGE IN NATIVE LANGUAGE USE was "no change", and PURPOSE OF NATIVE LANGUAGE USE was facilitation; or EXTENT OF NATIVE LANGUAGE USE IN ACADEMIC SUBJECTS was 1-89%, and CHANGE IN NATIVE LANGUAGE USE was "decrease".

Two subdivisions of C clusters were formed based on the variable RATE OF TRANSITION. A Type C1 cluster designates a Type C cluster with slow transition; a Type C2 cluster designates a C cluster with fast transition.

Type D: "All English with Special Instruction in English"

In Type D clusters, the instruction is essentially all in English and the students are taught English partially through the use of special instruction. (Operationally, the variable SPECIAL INSTRUCTION must have been scored as present.)

In most of the cases included as a Type D cluster, the EXTENT OF NATIVE LANGUAGE USE IN ACADEMIC SUBJECTS was zero percent. However, in certain Type D cases it was as high as 15%. Notwithstanding the use of some native language, these cases were still considered all-English-medium services, when the PROGRAM SELF DESCRIPTION variable did not indicate any form of a bilingual program and native language arts were not taught.

Two subdivisions of Type D clusters were formed based on the presence or absence of NATIVE-LANGUAGE-PROFICIENT PERSONNEL. Thus, a D1 cluster designates a D cluster with Native-Language-Proficient Personnel present; in a D2 cluster, Native-Language-Proficient Personnel are not present.

Type E: "All English without Special Instruction in English"

A Type E cluster designation indicates a regular mainstream instructional situation; that is, the students are part of an all-English-medium classroom and receive no instruction in English separate from the instruction normally received by English-proficient students.

Operationally, to be included as an E cluster, the variable SPECIAL INSTRUCTION had to be scored as "absent", and PROGRAM SELF-DESCRIPTION could not indicate any special services such as "bilingual program" or "native language arts instruction".

Although the assumption is that these are all-English-medium classrooms, and in most cases English is the only language used in instruction, EXTENT OF NATIVE LANGUAGE USE IN ACADEMIC SUBJECTS could be as high as 15 percent, as with Type D clusters. This allowed for the few cases in which all other type E cluster conditions were met, but in which students received a small amount of native language help from a teacher or aide.

Within the E cluster there are two subdivisions (E1 and E2) based on the presence or absence of Native-Language-Proficient Personnel, respectively.

Cluster sequences corresponding to cluster combinations

Cluster Sequence	Includes Cluster Combinations
1. Continued emphasis on native language	A/A, A/B, B/A, B/B
2. High or moderate to low native language use	A/C, B/C
3. High or moderate to minimal use of native language	A/D, B/D, A/EF, B/EF
4. Low use to low or moderate use	C/C, C/B
5. Low use to minimal use	C/D, C/EF
6. Marked increase in native language use	C/A, DEF/A, DEF/B
7. No use to low use of native language	DEF/C
8. No use of native language but with special instruction in English	DEF/D
9. No use of native language and no special instruction in English	DEF/EF

The four cluster combinations, A/A, A/B, B/A, and B/B, all of which indicate a substantial use of the native language in academic instruction are placed together in the first cluster sequence, "Continued Emphasis on Native Language." The second cluster sequence, "High or Moderate to Low Native Language Use," encompasses cluster combinations A/C and B/C and is marked by a transition during the year from the high or relative high use of the native language to low use of the native language in academic instruction.

The third cluster sequence, "High or Moderate to Minimal Native Language Use," combines the cluster combinations A/D, A/EF, B/D, and B/DEF. As shown in Table 7.6, these quick transitions to all-English-medium instruction occurred relatively infrequently in our sample.

The fourth cluster sequence, "Low Use to Low or Moderate Use of the Native Language," combines the relatively common sequence C/C, with the much less common sequence C/B. The rationale is that in most cases the shift from C to B is merely a short shift from just below the cutoff point of 37.5 percent to just above it. The educational experience is basically the same.

The fifth cluster sequence, "Low Use to Minimal Use," combines the relatively uncommon C/D and C/EF combinations. In both, the students' year began with a low level and ended with a minimal level of academic instruction in the native language.

The sixth cluster sequence, "Marked Increase in Native Language Use," combines the combinations C/A, DEF/A, and DEF/B, all of which indicate a jump of at least 30 percent in use of the native language from the beginning to the end of the year. As information from none of the schools suggested that such increases were programmatically based, it is believed that in most cases the jump was due to transferring either between programs or between schools.

The seventh cluster sequence, "No Use of Native Language to Low Use" is made up only of the relatively common DEF/C sequence. While it implies, as the sixth cluster sequence does, an increase in native language use, the change in most cases is believed to be quite small, from just below the 7.5 percent cut-off to just above it.

In both cluster sequences 8 and 9 there is continued minimal use of the native language. What differentiates them is that the former includes special instruction in English, while the latter does not.

REFERENCES

Guthrie, Larry and Rowan, Brian, et al.

1986 Instructional Services for Limited English Proficient Chapter 1 Students, Final Report. San Francisco, CA: Far West Laboratory for Educational Research and Development.

Kennedy, Mary, et al.

1986 Poverty, Achievement and the Distribution of Compensatory Education Services: An Interim Report From the National Assessment of Chapter 1. Report # 1986-159-197/50463. Washington, DC: U.S. Government Accounting Office.

United States General Accounting Office

1987 Bilingual Education: A New Look At The Research Evidence. Washington, DC: US. General Accounting Office.

Wong Fillmore, Lily and Ammon, Paul

1985 Learning English Through Bilingual Instruction, Final Report. University of California, Berkeley and Santa Cruz, CA.

Young, Malcom B., et al.

1986 Instructing Children With Limited English Proficiency, Year One Report of the National Longitudinal Evaluation of the Effectiveness of Services for Language-Minority, Limited-English-Proficient-Children. Arlington, VA: Development Associates, Inc. and Research Triangle Park, NC: Research Triangle Institute.